

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14-19, and 21-25 are pending in this application. Claims 7, 13, and 20 are canceled, Claims 6, 8, 9, 14, 19, and 21 are amended, and Claims 22-25 are added by the present amendment.

The claim amendments and new claims find support in the specification and claims as originally filed. In particular, new Claims 22-25 recite features similar to originally filed Claims 1, 2, 9, and 15, respectively. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Publication 2002/0019814 to Ganesan in view of U.S. Patent 5,910,987 to Ginter et al. (herein "Ginter").

Initially, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesy of a personal interview with Examiners Kamal and Worjloh on April 23, 2008. During the interview, differences between the claimed inventions and the disclosures of Ganesan and Ginter were discussed and the rejections in the Office Action were discussed. In particular, it was agreed that the cited portions of Ganesan and Ginter fail to teach or suggest the features of the independent claims. Comments discussed during the interview are reiterated below.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ganesan and Ginter.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing system that includes, in part, duplicate-license determination means for determining whether or not the license requested by the terminal from the license server duplicates a license already held by the terminal. The system also includes license-duplication reporting means for reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested by the terminal from the license server duplicates a

license already held by the terminal according to the determination result by the duplicate-license determination means. New independent Claim 22 recites similar features without using means plus function terminology. Independent Claims 2, 9, 15, and 23-25 are directed to apparatuses including similar features. Independent Claims 6, 12, and 19 are directed to methods including steps performing similar functions, and independent Claims 8, 14, and 21 are directed to computer-readable mediums storing computer executable programs which when executed by a computer perform steps including similar functions.

As discussed during the interview, Ganesan and Ginter fail to teach or suggest the features of the independent claims.

Initially, Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion in the Office Action at page 2, second paragraph from the bottom, that Ganesan at paragraph [0072] discloses a license server that includes the claimed duplicate-license determination means. On the other hand, as discussed during the interview, the cited portion of Ganesan describes a content server that may distribute or make available for retrieval packages 12p produced by an authoring tool 18, and the content server 22 may “be employed to copy the packages 12p onto magnetic or optical disks.”¹

In other words, Ganesan indicates that a content server may copy packages (e.g., content) onto magnetic or optical disks. However, Ganesan is silent regarding a determination as to whether or not a license requested by a terminal duplicates a license already held by the terminal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Ganesan fails to teach or suggest “duplicate-license determination means for determining whether or not the license requested by the terminal from the license server duplicates a license already held by the terminal,” as recited in Claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 19, and 21-25.

¹ Ganesan at paragraph [0072].

Further, Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion in the Office Action at page 3, first paragraph that Ginter discloses the claimed license-duplication reporting means. On the other hand, as discussed during the interview, the cited portions of Ginter indicate a system that may grant or deny access to content, may count how many times content authorization is granted, and may indicate an audit of content use. However, Ginter fails to teach or suggest any reporting of license duplication. Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, Ginter fails to teach or suggest "license-duplication reporting means for reporting license duplication indicating that the license requested by the terminal from the license server duplicates a license already held by the terminal according to the determination result by the duplicate-license determination means," as recited in independent Claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 19, and 21-25.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 19, and 21-25, and claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Ganesan and Ginter, and therefore are allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Zachary S. Stern
Registration No. 54,719

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

BDL:ZS\la
I:\ATTY\ZS\25\S\257\257909US\257909US-AM DUE 5-03-08.DOC